



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,106	08/23/2001	James M. Derderian	4832US (01-0104)	1038
63162 7590 09/19/2008 TRASK BRITT, P.C./ MICRON TECHNOLOGY P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110				
EXAMINER				
IM, JUNGHWAN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2811				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/19/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOMail@traskbritt.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/938,106

**Applicant(s)**

DERDERIAN, JAMES M.

**Examiner**

JUNGHWA M. IM

**Art Unit**

2811

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-27, 29-35, 40-51 and 53-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-27, 29-35, 40-51 and 53-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-643)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 45 recites the limitation "setting a back side of second semiconductor device against least some discrete conductive elements of the discrete conductive elements without adhesive material present over the active surface of the first semiconductor device, such that the second semiconductor device is entirely supported by the at least some discrete conductive elements." Note that the instant invention does not disclose that the final configuration of the stacked chips is without adhesive material over the active surface of the first semiconductor device. Rather, the instant invention explicitly shows that adhesive material is formed over the active surface of the first semiconductor device. Therefore, it is confusing how such that the second semiconductor device is entirely supported by the at least some discrete conductive elements since there is adhesive material between the first and the second semiconductor devices.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 23, 24, 29, 30, 33, 40, 45, 46, 49, 50, 53, 59 and 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al. (US 6400007), hereafter Wu.

Regarding claims 23 and 45, Fig. 4 of Wu shows a device to use a method for assembling semiconductor devices with a densely stacked arrangement (col.2, line 64 through col. 3, line 61), comprising:

a first semiconductor device 28;

discrete conductive elements 32 over portions of said first semiconductor device and;

setting a back side of a second semiconductor device 34 against over the first semiconductor device at least some of discrete conductive elements with the back side and at least some of discrete conductive elements being electrically isolated from each other (col.3, lines 54-56); and

introducing adhesive material 50 between the first semiconductor device and the second semiconductor device.

Regarding the limitation in the preamble of claim 45, Fig. 4 of Wu shows "semiconductor device in a stacked arrangement with stacked arrangement having a

height substantially equal to combined thickness of each of the semiconductor device and distances discrete conductive elements associated therewith protrude above said each of the semiconductor devices." In addition, note that the limitation in the preamble does not have patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

Regarding the limitation in claim 45 "setting a back side of second semiconductor device against least some discrete conductive elements of the discrete conductive elements without adhesive material present over the active surface of the first semiconductor device, such that the second semiconductor device is entirely supported by the at least some discrete conductive element," it is understood that there is no adhesive material present over the active surface of the first semiconductor device until the adhesive material is introduced to stack the second semiconductor device over the first semiconductor device.

Regarding claims 24 and 46, Wu discloses positioning the second semiconductor device comprises positioning the second semiconductor device on said at least some of discrete conductive elements with the back side and the discrete conductive elements in mutual electrical isolation (col.3, lines 54-56).

Regarding claims 29 and 49, Wu discloses a quantity of adhesive material 50 to at least an active surface of the first semiconductor device (col.3, lines 24-25).

Regarding claims 30 and 50, it is inherent that the device of Wu shows drawing the second semiconductor device toward the first semiconductor device after applying the adhesive on the first device since the adhesive is applied on the active surface of the first semiconductor device and positioning the second semiconductor device is followed.

Regarding claims 33 and 53, it is inherent that the applying is effected after the positioning the second semiconductor device since positioning the second semiconductor device has to be done before permanent adhering to the first semiconductor device.

Regarding claims 40 and 59, Wu discloses securing the first semiconductor device and a substrate to one another (col.3, lines 16-20).

Regarding claim 61, it is inherent that electrical communication would be established between bond pads of the second semiconductor device (34) and the corresponding contact areas of the substrate (col. 3, lines 41-43) in order to have the device operate functionally.

Regarding claim 62, Fig. 4 of Wu shows establishing communication comprises placing additional discrete conductive elements (56; wires) between each of the bond pads and the corresponding contact area of the corresponding contact areas.

Regarding claim 63, Fig. 4 of Wu shows providing at least one connective elements (42; signal output terminal) in communication with at least one bond pad of each of said first and second semiconductor devices (col. 3, lines 4-8).

Regarding claim 64, Wu discloses a method further comprising encapsulating (58 in Fig. 4; a packaging layer) said first and second semiconductor devices (col. 3, lines 44-47).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25, 26, 31, 34, 35, 41-44, 47, 51, 54-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under obviousness over Wu in view of Lee et al. (US 6,388,313), hereafter Lee.

Regarding claims 25 and 47, Wu discloses the most aspect of the instant invention except "providing a dielectric coating on at least portion of said discrete conductive elements." Lee discloses a method providing a dielectric coating on at least portion of said discrete conductive elements (col. 5, lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply a coat on the discrete conductive elements (wires) of Wu's device with the teaching of Lee in order to prevent a short circuit between the semiconductor device and the bare wires.

Regarding claim 26, Lee shows a method wherein the providing comprises forming at least one of a dielectric oxide and a dielectric polymer coating on at least said

portions of the discrete conductive elements (col. 5, lines 22-24).

Regarding claims 31 and 51, Wu does not disclose "said drawing is effected by at least one of capillary action of the adhesive material, curing of the adhesive material, application of heat to the adhesive material, and vibration of the adhesive material." However, it would be obvious that such drawing is effected by one of the effects recited by the pending claim since Wu's adhesive material (resin) is identical to the one recited in the instant invention. Furthermore, Lee discloses the drawing is effected by at least curing of the adhesive material (resin) and application of heat to the adhesive material (curing; col. 5, lines 32-40).

The limitations regarding claims 34 and 35 have been discussed in claims 30 and 31 with the combined teaching of Wu and Lee.

Regarding claim 41, Wu does not disclose "said placing the discrete conductive elements comprises securing the discrete conductive elements to contact areas of the substrate and the bond pads of the first semiconductor device." Lee shows a method wherein the placing the discrete conductive elements comprises securing the discrete conductive elements to contact areas of the substrate and the bond pads of the first semiconductor device (col. 5, lines 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Lee into the device of Wu in order to have signals transferred between the stacked devices through having the discrete conductive elements (wires) secured on the contact areas (bond pads) on the substrate.



Regarding claim 42, Lee shows the securing comprises electrically connecting bond pads of the second semiconductor device to the corresponding contacts areas of the substrate (col. 5, lines 13-16).

Regarding claim 43, Lee shows encapsulating at least portion of at least one of the substrate, the first semiconductor device, and the second semiconductor device (col. 6, lines 32-36).

Regarding claim 44, Lee shows forming external conductive elements 27 in Fig. 1 on the substrate in electrical communication with corresponding contact areas (col. 5, lines 1-4).

Limitations of claims 54 and 55 have been discussed in claims 34 and 35.

Regarding claim 56, Wu fails to disclose "biasing at least one of the first and second semiconductor devices toward the other of the first and second semiconductor devices." Lee shows biasing at least one of the first and second semiconductor devices toward the other of the first and second semiconductor devices (col. 4, lines 54-68). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Lee into the device of Wu in order to have an electrical connection for a necessary circuit configuration of the device.

Regarding claim 57, Lee shows controlling the biasing by means of adhesive (col. 4, lines 54-68).

Regarding claim 58, Lee shows the controlling the biasing comprises controlling the biasing force to a level sufficient to deform, kink, bend, or collapse the discrete conductive elements.

See the respective portions of the specification such as col. 5, lines 24-32.

Regarding claim 60, Wu fails to show “connecting the discrete conductive elements to corresponding contact areas of the substrate.” Lee shows connecting the discrete conductive elements to corresponding contact areas of the substrate (col. 5, lines 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Lee into the device of Wu in order to have current flow from supply contact areas of the substrate to the semiconductor devices through the discrete conductive elements (wires).

Claims 27, 32 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under obviousness over Wu in view of Shim et al. (US 6,531,784), hereafter Shim.

Regarding claims 27 and 48, Wu does not disclose positioning a dielectric layer at least portions of the backside of the second semiconductor device. Fig. 7 of Shim shows the dielectric layer (50C) on the portion of the backside of the second semiconductor device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Shim into the device of Wu in order to enhance the electrical isolation between the devices and the wires.

Regarding claim 32, Wu does not disclose positioning a dielectric layer at least portions of the backside of the second semiconductor device. Fig. 3 of Shim shows the dielectric layer (44) on the portion of the backside of the second semiconductor device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to incorporate the teaching of Shim into the device of Wu in order to mount two devices securely.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 06/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph are maintained. Note that the instant invention recites the limitation implying that the top/upper semiconductor device is entirely supported by the wires on the lower semiconductor device. As discussed above in the office action, this limitation is not disclosed. Rather, the instant invention discloses that the top/upper semiconductor device is supported by the adhesive material and the wires on the lower semiconductor device. And Applicant further states in the paper filed 09/03/2002, that "Species 2, ... a method that includes superimposing two semiconductor devices, then introducing a quantity of material therebetween." This indicates that there is substantial amount of adhesive between two semiconductor devices, therefore, the top/upper semiconductor device cannot be supported *entirely* supported by the wires alone. (emphasis added.)

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is maintained. Applicant argues "Rather, the adhered glue layer 30 in Wu (and the subsequently formed overflow glue 50 which is an extension or overflow of adhered glue layer 30) is applied before the second semiconductor chip is secured over the first semiconductor chip, as seen in FIG. 3 of Wu. Claim 1, however, recites "introducing a second adhesive material between the first

semiconductor device and the second semiconductor device." Examiner disagrees. Note that the instant invention does not recite that the top semiconductor device is placed on the bottom semiconductor device followed by adding the adhesive inbetween. Rather, the instant invention merely recites that adhesive material is introduced between the top and the bottom devices. And the instant invention shows that the application of the adhesive on top of the bottom device folloed by stacking of the top device.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNGHWA M. IM whose telephone number is (571)272-1655. The examiner can normally be reached on MON.-FRI. 7:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne A. Gurley can be reached on (571) 272-1670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Lynne A. Gurley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2811

/J. M. I./

Examiner, Art Unit 2811



